

DRAFT
Minutes of the Population Technical Advisory Committee

Friday, December 3, 2004
DERS Conference Room
1789 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Arizona State University – Tom Rex
Department of Economic Security – Linda Strock / Peter Kozy
Department of Health Services – Richard Porter
Department of Revenue – Karen Jacobs
Department of Water Resources – John Fortune
Department of Transportation – Joe Flaherty
Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona – Norm Petersen
Central Arizona Association of Governments – Bill Leister
Maricopa Association of Governments – Harry Wolfe/Anubhav Bagley
Northern Arizona Council of Governments – Chris Fetzer
Pima Association of Governments – Sandy White
South Eastern Arizona Governments Organization – Rich Gaar
Western Arizona Council of Governments – Dave Barber
*City of Phoenix – Tim Tilton
*Department of Environmental Quality – David Lillie
*State Land Department – Mila Hill

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Department of Commerce
Department of Education
League of Arizona Cities & Towns
Northern Arizona University
The Navajo Nation
University of Arizona
County Supervisors Association of Arizona
*Department of Insurance
*Maricopa County Department of Human Services
*Yuma Metropolitan Planning Organization

ALSO PRESENT:

Samuel Colón, Department of Economic Security
Betty Jeffries, Department of Economic Security
Susan Kanzler, Department of Economic Security

*NON-VOTING MEMBER

DRAFT

Minutes of the Population Technical Advisory Committee
December 3, 2004

Attachment A
Page 2

1. Call to Order.

Richard Porter called the meeting to order at 10:30 am.

2. Approval of Minutes of Prior POPTAC Meeting.

Richard Porter asked if there were any comments on the minutes for the prior meeting. There were no comments or discussion. Richard Porter called for a motion.

Rich Gaar moved and Norm Peterson seconded the motion to approve minutes as written from the November 12th POPTAC meeting. The motion was approved.

3. New business.

Richard Porter made a call to the audience for new business. Linda Strock presented a plaque to Richard for his fine effort during his tenure as chairman.

4. Call for nominations for a new POPTAC chairman.

Richard Porter asked if there were nominations from the floor for a new chairman. Peter Kozy stated that John Fortune had volunteered for the post. No other nominations were put forth. Richard Porter called for a motion.

Rich Gaar moved and Linda Strock seconded the motion to nominate John Fortune as the POPTAC chairman for 2005. The motion unanimously passed.

5. 2005 POPTAC meeting calendar.

There was discussion concerning the proposed four meeting 2005 POPTAC calendar. Harry Wolfe expressed concern about the gap of January to May between the first and second meetings in light of the estimates and their importance this year in determining revenue sharing. There was discussion about the meeting frequency. It was determined that the January and December meetings were good dates but Joe Flaherty said the two middle dates were in conflict with COG member meetings with ADOT. Peter Kozy asked that possible alternate Friday dates around the two middle calendar dates be emailed to him. Rich Gaar expressed a concern about conflict in early October. Linda Strock discussed the meeting strategy for 2005. She proposed keeping the quarterly schedule, having a possible one to two meetings as needed as issues may arise. There was also discussion that we could have methodology meetings without the full POPTAC meeting. Linda Strock discussed the pending contract negotiations with a PhD demographer and how this may impact future meetings.

Linda Strock made a motion that we accept the proposed 2005 POPTAC quarterly meeting schedule with the caveat that the two middle dates will be rescheduled to avoid current conflict and that we may need to schedule one or two additional meetings as needed to discuss projections. Rich Gaar seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

6. Reconsideration of County estimates in light of the change to Maricopa City.

It was explained by David Lillie that because of the special census done in Maricopa City before and not included in the originally approved estimates, 1000 people had to be added to Maricopa City, Pinal County, and the state. Richard Porter asked for a motion of approval.

Richard Gaar made a motion to approve the revised July 1, 2004 estimates. Bill Leister seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

7. Recommendation of the sub-county estimates.

It was explained by David Lillie that the majority of the methodology committee thought that the sub-county estimates looked reasonable. Linda Strock stated that there were no issues brought up about input errors or methodology problems. Richard Porter asked for comments and there were none. Dave Barber commented that Bullhead City had some concerns and talked to Peter about them.

John Fortune made a motion to approve the sub-county estimates. Joe Flaherty seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Rich Gaar made comment about how difficult it was to explain the sub-county figures to the jurisdictions and expressed the hope that DES provide more explanatory information to assist COG staff in working with elected officials next year. Linda Strock said although the comments and suggestions have been helpful and that it might be good to have an outsider (referring to PhD demographer) come in and review our process. Chris Fetzer said Coconino County and Flagstaff had issues also. Dave Barber stated that in Bullhead City it was the opposite. The Composite number was higher than the HUM and brought Bullhead City's number down. Rich Gaar said the same was true of Graham County.

8. County Projections

David Lillie reported that the methodology committee had received the county handouts but that there was a mistake on the first page. Susan Kanzler agreed that it should have read for the period of 2001 to 2004 not 2000 to 2004. David Lillie said that we talked about data adjustments and all agreed the numbers looked reasonable. Tom Rex wanted Susan to look at the migration rates by age group between 1990 and 2000 for the state only. Discussed domestic and international migration and that international

migration may not be captured. Talked about births in Maricopa County and the fact that they were higher than expected which may indicate a change in migration patterns. Also discussed that the adjustment made for growth is made once and continues throughout the projections period. The model is constructed in such a way that any additional factors applied in the first 10 years of the projections would be compounded, or applied in addition to any prior factors. Susan said she would look into the possibility of changing the application of the factors so that they affect only a single year rather than the entire projections period. Peter Kozy brought in a graph of Arizona population showing Arizona's population increasing at a decreasing rate. Susan stated that she would send out detail about her adjustment method. David Lillie also stressed the committees feeling of the importance of the estimates to the projection model. He went on further to say that, in general, the projections looked reasonable. Richard Porter stated we ought to look closer at migration in the future along with the race / ethnicity issue as a longer-term project. Sandy White and Richard Porter asked Susan about a timeline for the projections. Susan responded that county projections would be presented at the January meeting and sub-county probably two months after that. Dave Barber asked if there would be an explanation of the input data used. Susan said yes. Richard Porter inquired, if the county projections are approved in January, would they become official in January. Linda Strock responded in the affirmative.

Tim Tilton asked if the Maricopa Census survey would be adjusted up or down to fit into the state estimate. Linda responded yes but that Maricopa would not have to use the state estimates for revenue sharing. There was discussion on this topic. Linda explained that we have an arrangement with the Economic Estimates Commission that if we have better data after the December 15th estimates presentation, we will provide it to the Commission.

With that, Richard Porter asked if there was anything else. There was nothing and Richard adjourned the meeting at 11:12.